DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 199 192 SP 017 452

AUTHOR Howey, Kenneth R.
TITLE Organization For Inservice Teacher Education: A Perspective From Higher Education.
PUB DATE [76]
NOTE 22p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; *Inservice Teacher Education; Postsecondary Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *School Districts; *Schools of Education; Teacher Centers; *Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Educator Education

ABSTRACT

Institutions of higher education can be organized as viable and vital contributors to inservice teacher education programs. A critical reexamination of the relationship between preservice and inservice training is needed. Inservice is only one part of a continuing education process, which should be organized both within and between schools and colleges for maximum effect. Resources are often limited and must be amplified and used efficiently. The following strategies could be explored: (1) development of periodic program prototypes for improving training and curriculum materials; (2) improved application and assistance in using electronic technology for inservice; and (3) design of programs for training teacher educators. Cooperative efforts between colleges and departments of education should lead to formal relationships, benefiting both parties. (FG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Exhibit Daly

PB 1430

ED199192

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kenneth R. Howey

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Organization For Inservice Teacher Education: A Perspective From Higher Education

Kenneth R. Howey
University of Minnesota

SP 017 452

Inservice teacher education (ISTE) is defined in a variety of ways and often used synonomously with such terms as staff development, continuing education, personnel development, and continuing professional development. It is generally agreed that, regardless of preference in terminology, this activity occurs 1) after the teacher has received his or her initial teaching certificate and 2) has begun employment. There is no denying that inservice has been defined in fairly narrow and prescribed ways by some. If the spectrum of activity that one party or another perceives as inservice is considered, however, it is clear - especially for those concerned about how to organize it - that this is a complex multi-dimensional enterprise.

Inservice can embrace activities engaged in alone or in groups of varying size and role composition; it can range from informal on-the-job observations to prescribed workshops or courses after hours; it can focus on the resolution of a specific teaching problem or eminate from a desire for greater understanding of one's self - apart from any specific role or context. This writer has identified at least six basic departure points for why teachers pursue inservice at various times:

1) as induction activities to allow for movement from generalized preservice education to the assumption of a specific role - <u>transitional</u>
2) as a response to typically reoccurring needs and problems in one's situation - <u>job-specific</u>
3) as a response to more dramatic changes in society, and in turn schools, which mandate role reorientation or redefinition - <u>system related</u>

4) as a matter of staying current professionally without regard to immediate transfer or application to one's specific situation - general professional development

5) as a means of changing role or responsibilities - career progression

6) as a process of understanding and enhancing the person in a professional role - personal development

Of what utility is such a primitive typology? It provides one perspective in trying to analyze and understand the various purposes served by inservice endeavors. It could be used to assist planners and organizers to better plan a balanced inservice agenda in light of different, and at times competing, interests and needs. And finally, it might facilitate basic governance decisions. Who should support, deliver, or evaluate various inservice undertakings will to some extent depend upon the basic reason the teacher is engaged in that activity.

A priority of the first order in organizing for ISTE in general is to better delineate the various needs and interests of both the school system and the constituencies it serves, as well as the teacher individually and collectively. For example, if a pattern or profile of each teacher's recent inservice activities along each of the above six dimensions were to be analyzed, future ISTE activities might well be planned in a manner more responsive and integrative to all parties concerned. While the primary purpose of this paper is not to explore how inservice might be conceptualized, it is suggested that such effort is a prerequisite to effective organization.

Just as there are various departure points for why one engages in inservice, there are similar vantage points from where decisions about ISTE are made. Teachers, of course, are at the core of the ISTE decision-making

process. Local Education Agencies and School Boards are also primary actors in this process. The State Departments of Education are increasingly assuming a major role. The role of higher education in ISTE, on the other hand, is perhaps less clear. In fact, some question whether institutions of higher education (IHEs) can make any type of major contribution to ISTE. This paper will not attempt to deal with the complex issues of organization and governance between different entities within and without education who have a vested interest in ISTE. As stated above, a better understanding of what is encompassed under this umbrella concept of inservice would seem to be in order first. It does appear within the scope of this paper to review how one of the major contributors to inservice traditionally - higher education - might organize to contribute more effectively to ISTE, especially in light of current criticism about its role in this process. This paper in no way suggests that IHEs are the central figures in this phase of teacher education but does contend that they can be organized as a most viable and vital partner in the process.

The Relationship of Pre- to Inservice

The degree of ISTE needed or desired is in many respects determined by a number of related conditions: the stability or degree of change in school programs and teacher roles, the range of responsibilities a teacher is asked to assume, and the working conditions enveloping the teacher, such as the numbers and types of students assigned to him or her, and the material resources available. Certainly, one critical factor in determining the extent to which ISTE is needed initially is the quality and quantity of preservice training the teacher has previously

engaged in. What would the ISTE needs be for a widely recruited and rigorously screened beginning teacher who completed an extended preservice program and then followed this with an internship paralleling medical training?

No unrealistic reform will be called for here in terms of either the expansion or alteration of preservice programs. Rather the plea is for those concerned with the organization of inservice to also engage in critical study of 1) what type of teacher education might best be engaged in during the preservice phase, and 2) how a more formal induction period might be provided the newly certificated teacher and 3) what might best be included here in terms of appropriate educational experiences as well. The relationship between activities planned in pre- and inservice is not at all clear and post-certification internships or induction training periods are rare. The AACTE Bicentennial Commission on Education for the Profession of Teaching stated unequivocally that, "To meet its responsibilities to society, the teaching profession requires a significantly enlarged and expanded initial preparation program."[1]

Little research has been conducted into the organization of teacher education curriculum and instruction. Fuller's[2] pioneer efforts suggest that prospective teachers (and quite possibly experienced teachers as well) share some common concerns when pursuing new education endeavors. Their major concerns move in a fairly regular sequence from concerns about oneself as an individual, to concerns about the teaching task, and finally to concerns about the effects of their actions on pupils. A variety of preservice training schemes which move from reception type modes of teacher learning, to focused simulation and practice, and finally to controlled clinical settings have long been advanced. The basic modus

is for all the parallel curricula to culminate in a supervised classroom setting (student teaching) prior to initial certification. This model of graduated responsibility, however, might well vary considerably from one content area to another. It may be that certain curricular components now common to most preservice programs are best deferred in terms of such graduated development to a more formal induction period. Classroom management, the implications of environmental psychology for arranging classroom learning space, concepts of curricular integration, and dimensions of growth and development applied to diagnosis and design are but a few of the more sophisticated knowledges and skills that might be reassessed in terms of how well they can be internalized without more substantive teaching experience than that provided in student teaching.

On the other hand, there would appear to be numerous teacher education experiences (which are not now emphasized in the preservice curriculum) that might best be achieved initially in the more controlled environment of the college. The systematic observation and analysis of instruction, team or collaborative planning and problem-solving, and more sophisticated approaches to documentation, measurement, and evaluation, for example, don't demand prerequisite experience and competence in managing large numbers of students.

In summary, ISTE will be advanced if there is more in-depth study of what content is most effectively engaged in, in what format and at what stage of teacher development. A critical (re)examination of the relationship between 'pre'- and 'in'-service is needed. There is also the concurrent need to pilot transition or induction programs for the beginning teacher. What specific role the State Department, IHEs, and LEAs might assume in providing a more formal continuing education component in the first year or two of teaching is no clearer than what the most effective staging of teacher

education experiences might be. Better baseline data on current practices and how effective they are in both of these areas is needed. Some planned program variation in these areas would also provide guidelines currently lacking for fundamental organizational decisions on ISTE.

Relation of Teacher Education to School Renewal

As shortsighted as policy decisions on ISTE are which respond only to needs, without analysis of why they exist or when they might best be attended to, are those ISTE decisions based primarily upon individual needs with little, if any, concern about their collective impact on the quality and direction of school programs. Reform in teacher education cannot occur without concommitant reform in schooling. Haberman minced no words when he stated, "We wasted a decade trying to equalize schooling by appealing to individuals. NDEA Institutes, masters programs, sabbaticals, etc., like all historical efforts to improve teacher education, are based on the monumental idiocy that each Susie Smith will, in the process of pursuing her own best interests, make a contribution that will culminate into important social change."[3]

While the collective effect of individual effort may have been underestimated by Haberman, there are few who would deny schools could not improve in a variety of respects - especially in terms of coordinated programmatic efforts. At this time, a number of signs point to heightened efforts to respond to individual needs and a lessening of ISTE effort more directly related to program reform. If such an imbalance exists, this is cause for real concern. Recent research suggests a greater degree of coherence, especially in elementary schools, between teachers and such basic elements as teaching styles, curriculum approaches, and materials,

may be a key ingredient to student success.

An organizational scheme is outlined here to provide a model not only of better linkage between pre- and inservice but between teacher development and program design. Project OPEN, sponsored by the University of Minnesota/Minneapolis Public Schools Teacher Center, brought to bear a variety of resources from the College to assist in the design and development of a more coherent school alternative; in this case an open school. After the school had been in operation for three years, it became a prototype for training teachers both pre- and inservice. In return for the college's investment in the design of this prototype school (a theory into practice function which IHEs have largely neglected by the way, and which supposedly is at the core of the CBTE movement), the schools collaborated fully in the design of not only inservice, but related preservice, for teachers desirous of teaching in such schools.

Throughout the following school year, selected teachers in the open school, together with college faculty, engaged in continuing task and behavior analyses of what transpired in their school. Based upon these observations and recordings, these teachers assisted in the development of curriculum and training materials for both preservice and experienced teachers. They were also involved in the selection of the students into the preservice phase of the program. Other experienced inservice teachers in the larger Minneapolis System were now provided internships in the Open School, as well as training in the materials which had been developed. These teacher-interns in turn released the experienced open school teachers who had assisted in the development of the preservice program to actually team teach with the college faculty in the preservice program. On Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, different teachers from the Open School worked

with the preservice students on campus and on Tuesday and Thursday, they applied many of the concepts with these same students in their classrooms.

In summary, then, an organizational scheme was implemented where college faculty assisted in the design and development of a coherent school prototype and provided some corollary inservice. In turn, selected teachers contributed substantively to the design and implementation of an alternative training project for preservice teachers. A developmental link was formed 1) between pre- and inservice and 2) between renewal in teacher education and schooling. An expanded but most appropriate role for the scholar in school renewal (and attendent staff development) was reciprocated by an expanded and again most appropriate role by the practitioner in all phases of preservice education. A conceptual plan which attended to basic relationships, often otherwise ignored, was translated into a cost-effective operational scheme.

To this point it has been suggested that ISTE is only one part of a continuing teacher education process and that to have maximum effect it should be related as often as possible to more coherent efforts to improve schooling. Any serious effort to achieve the above related goals demands a high degree of organizational skill. More effective organization within Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education, as well as between themselves and the schools, is needed. Clark and Guba state, "Some Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education (SCDEs) adopt missions which are not synchronized with their faculty strengths, constituency, base of fiscal support, or general IHE environment. These mission mismatches almost always lead to low morale and productivity. Mission over-reach frequently builds up over time as pressures increase on the SCDE to take on all the problems confronted by education in a community, region, or state. The sharpest examples of this problem in

recent years come from urban based SCDEs which have been pressed to solve the urban community's educational problems with a handful of staff hired to teach classes to undergraduate students. SCDEs seem to give little time and attention to the trade-offs involved in the assumption of new or expanded missions. New missions are accepted as good things to do: opportunities not to be lost. The opportunity costs, what will have to be given up or done less well, are rarely or incompletely considered."[4]

Coordination of Limited Resources

SCDEs often have limited resources to respond to the multiple needs of inservice education. For example, the college of education in which this writer resides has a teacher education faculty of about sixty, this is roughly equivalent to the number of school districts in the greater metropolitan area encompassing the college. While there are limited resources, one should not underestimate the relatively large number of certificated teachers reached through conventional mechanisms. Those teachers pursuing at least two of the six types of inservice outlined earlier - 'general professional development' and 'career progression' - often take college courses or enroll in graduate programs. There are three major vehicles which allow teachers to pursue this common dimension of inservice: 1) late afternoon, evening and Saturday classes on campus, 2) Summer Sessions and 3) extension classes. The total numbers of teachers in service enrolled among these three units, while substantial, is not altogether clear, because frequently these are separately administered programs. A major organizational challenge for many SCDEs is the more effective coordination of these three units. In most cases, this effort would speak to the mission overreach observed by Clark and Guba.

Amplification of Resources

This more effective coordination of traditional resources, while a major step forward for many, would still fall short of the potential many SCDEs have with respect to ISTE. Clark and Guba noted that little time and attention is given to potential 'trade-offs' when new or expanded missions are assumed. You will recall, however, that multiple trade-offs are possible as indicated in the development of the open school prototype. New directions can be initiated. SCDEs often have an amplification as much as as a coordination of resources problem. Minimizing redundancy or providing more continuity between different delivery units such as day school and extension will not allow a limited number of faculty to reach that many more teachers. Likewise, the probability of adding faculty to deliver ISTE is low.

Therefore, three suggestions for the better amplification of limited resources are presented here: 1) the development of school prototypes with accompanying curriculum or training materials, 2) the utilization of media, and 3) the training of school-based teacher educators. An example of how a school prototype was designed and developed was briefly shared earlier to illustrate the relationship between ISTE and school renewal. This type of strategy seems most appropriate, especially for the College of Education, which is part of a larger University. The primary mission of such institutions is not teacher preparation per se but needed research and development in teacher education. Research and development in <u>how</u> teachers are prepared (such as more serious study of the relationship between pre - transitional - and continuing education) and <u>what</u> types of teachers are needed (such as validating the skills, knowledges and attributes needed to teach successfully in open classrooms) must be advanced. There has been from this perspective far too much developmental energy in teacher

education toward programs which more effectively produce teacher models already anachronistic to a large degree.

Schools today present many opportunities for creative research, program, and personnel development. For example, collaborative or team teaching models have never approached their potential. Role differentiation among teachers in elementary schools is a potentially powerful concept which has generally been limited to an implied curricular specialization. Little has been done in designing teacher role models with more differentiated and sophisticated instructional expertise. On the other hand, little has really been done programmatically in terms of offering basic alternative approaches to the curriculum within the same elementary school or between neighboring schools. A critical mass approach for concentrated periods of time can result in alternative prototypes in schools which can be studied by many. The SCDEs further amplify resources when corollary alternative curriculum or training materials are developed which can be transported. Bush, while not advocating a demonstration function, underscored the need to move in this direction when he stated, "Teacher Education thus moves in the next decade in a phase in which the entire school in a natural setting rather than the individual trainee as at present, becomes the main unit for teacher education."[5]

He also notes several other characteristics which deserve mention: such schools would participate voluntarily, for a designated period of time, and each of the major constituents, the community, the members of the profession and the LEA would have an authentic and vigorous voice in the enterprise. This paper was written from the perspective of organizing the IHEs for a more diversified and viable role in ISTE. While the focus here is on higher

education, the writer reminds again that there is no attempt to deny the major role and responsibility of teachers, or the school district and community in ISTE. The implication here is not one of bringing 'The Word from on High,' but rather an attempt to suggest guidelines for more authentic transaction and exchange between LEAs and IHEs in all phases of teacher education and school renewal.

A second means of amplifying limited resources is through the use of media and technology. Both in-house and closed circuit television, telecommunication, duplex or two-way television, amplified telephone, computer networking and computer-assisted instruction through mobile van are among the technological modes which can provide greater amplification of resources. The initial costs of such approaches are well known and are often an obvious constraint to their use. In many cases, however, existing technology is not well utilized in ISTE. It is not unusual for faculty in SCDEs to lack understanding of the potential outreach available through technology. Subsequently, they have relied upon more traditional and, in terms of potential impact, limiting approaches to ISTE. There is little doubt that the emphasis on ISTE will continue and dimensions of that process can be achieved in a quality way through technology. A basic question, then, for many SCDEs is to what extent might a reallocation of resources to provide greater understanding of and assistance with technology to their faculty having responsibilities for ISTE be a more effective strategy than expanding traditional personnel resources to meet ISTE needs.

A third strategy for the amplification of limited resources in IHEs is the trainer of trainers approach. The first phase of the ISTE Concepts Study[6] included interviews with over 1,000 education professionals and more than 200 policy makers at the state and national levels. This study found

that there was little quarrel with the cruciality of ISTE and that as it presently exists, it is accompanied by a rather vast and complex organization. It was estimated that there are 70,000-80,000 education professors, supervisors, and consultants engaged full or part-time as instructors in ISTE (one instructor for every 25 teachers presently employed). There are, in addition, almost 100,000 principals and vice-principals in the 17,000 school districts of this nation. Finally, there are another 50,000 personnel, such as reading or media specialists. "There may well be then, as many as a quarter of a million persons in the United States who engage as instructors in some form of ISTE activity--this is about one instructor for every eight teachers. Not included in these figures are team leaders and other persons who have formal or informal supervisory roles within the classroom, of which there may be tens of thousands; department chairpersons, especially at the secondary level, who participate to some degree in the inservice domain; and teachers who themselves staff inservice courses. Possibly as many as twenty-five thousand teachers each year serve their fellow teachers and aides as instructors in courses, workshops, or other events.

The size of this apparent investment is confusing for several reasons. First, it is confusing because so many people seem to feel the effort is very weak--even impoverished--and is a relative failure. Second, most districts and higher education institutions evidently believe that more funds are urgently needed to develop adequate staff development programs. Third, if the above estimates are at all reasonable, then we are led to the unnerving conclusion that one of the largest training enterprises in the United States is an incredible failure!"[7]

These initial data support the need for better programs of training inservice teacher educators. They would also support the widely held

assumption that there are several persons who might benefit from such programs. The position long advocated here is that while we have had a considerable variety of people in positions who contribute to specific dimensions of curricular, instructional or organization renewal, there have rarely been persons who could understand and manage the multiple dimensions of program and staff development well. This situation has greatly deterred from coherent and coordinated approaches to both ISTE and continuing school renewal. If, as this writer observed in his recent survey,[8] the trend is toward more 'job-embedded' inservice, then more sophisticated training of trainers for on-site teacher education becomes even more important. There are increasingly efforts in this direction. For example, The Houston Teacher Center Project is currently administering a developmental effort titled, "Improving the Competency of School-Based Teacher Educators Through CBTE Training and Credentialling Systems."[9] The basic objectives of this project include the identification and specification of competencies for the school-based teacher educator, the design of training and assessment systems, and the involvement of selected Teacher Centers in the Texas Network in prototypes and field tests of SBTE training systems.

The graduate programs at most colleges of education in major universities include such fields of study as both curriculum and instructional design, evaluation, organizational development, personnel development and counseling, and the study of teaching. A variety of interdisciplinary programs could be fashioned to provide inservice teacher educators with a greater breadth and depth of design and development skills. Such program exploration would not seem that arduous an organization chore and would certainly speak to a very basic need.

A recent project sponsored by the University of Minnesota/Minneapolis Teacher Center outlined a number of areas in which on-site personnel could be trained to facilitate inservice teacher education - especially for teachers in a system committed to alternatives. The following areas were identified for potential on-site lead teachers or teacher educators to select from and focus upon in their study.

Program Clarification Strategies: a focus upon variations in curriculum and instruction and clarification strategies to assist both community and fellow professionals in analyzing potential program variations

Interaction Strategies: a focus upon process skills appropriate to initiating and maintaining a dialogue between community/school/college

Task and Role Analyses: a focus upon more clearly identifying and analyzing the range of demands upon a teacher and how they define the teacher's role; strategies for engaging in analyses of both what a teacher actually is doing and would like to do

Behavior Analyses: a focus upon tools and strategies for systematically describing different dimensions of teacher-learner behavior such as communication patterns, social interactions, cognitive patterns, non-verbal behavior, and student interaction with the environment

Staff Differentiation Strategies: a focus upon possible alternative teaching roles and approaches for teachers such as diagnostic models, inquiry models, counseling/group process models, materials/resource development models, or technologist/didactic models

Staff Collaboration Strategies: a focus upon the refinement of general communication and curricular decision-making skills in teams, also included are such pragmatic functions as identifying the different types of meetings necessary for planning, evaluative reporting, and self-renewal, and the ways in which times can be found to engage in these activities on a more continuing basis.

Data Collection and Evaluation Strategies: A focus upon what types of data need to be collected on a continuing basis and how teachers, students, community and other resource people can be engaged in collecting, recording, storing, and using that formative data."[10]

In summary, SCDEs would do well to examine what organizational structures might bring the variety of approaches they employ in responding to ISTE together in a more coordinated manner. This process would critically examine the articulation, or lack of it, between conventional approaches such as day school, summer sessions, and extension. In addition, the following strategies for amplifying limited resources could be explored: 1) the development of periodic program prototypes in which training and curriculum materials for teachers are advanced, 2) the better application of existing electronic technology to ISTE and more adequate technical assistance for faculty to utilize it and 3) the design of programs for training teacher educators.

In addition to their own efforts, it is obvious that SCDEs will engage in a variety of cooperative efforts to meet ISTE goals. Just one example is included here. SCDEs will often establish a more formal partnership with a school district or districts. The Center alluded to several times throughout this paper was formally established in a contractual relationship between the Board of Regents of the University of Minnesota and the Board of Education of the Minneapolis Schools. It grew out of a mutual concern to provide

quality teacher education, both pre- and inservice. It serves as a multi-faceted delivery system for program development and teacher education. It responds to what are identified as common priorities of both systems. The limits set for this paper preclude discussion of its differentiated governance structure and its internal organization. It is noted here in closing because more formal collaboration is the prevailing trend in teacher education. Effective partnership does not happen overnight, and the process entails many problems. Yet, there are also obvious benefits. As a means of summarizing many of the points discussed earlier in this paper, the following is a list of potential benefits this writer has identified for IHEs and LEAs who engage in a more formal and continuing partnership: (In addition to facilitating the tasks below, such a 'center' structure might well be the organizational vehicle for coordinating the more conventional IHE responses to ISTE outlined earlier, as well as the three strategies posed for greater amplification of resources)

"(1) the identification of appropriate and realistic ways in which college(s) of education might assist a school system(s) with needs assessment (program priorities) and role analyses (teacher effectiveness in these programs); both of these activities are essential to more accurately determine training needs, both pre- and inservice;

(2) the identification of appropriate and realistic ways in which a school system(s) and its personnel might provide input into preservice training models in the college(s);

(3) assistance to both the school system and the college in relating initial training to continuing training;

(4) the identification of appropriate and realistic ways in which a college of education might contribute to the transitional and continuing phases of teacher renewal in the school system(s);

(5) assistance in systematically reviewing the combined training resources of both the college(s) and the system(s) to identify possible complementary, shared, and pooled personnel resources. Joint appointments, rotating assignments and shared facilities can be achieved through the teacher center concept;

(6) determination of existing personnel from both systems who might be assigned periodically for external auditing or summative evaluation of one another's programs, possibly on a trade-off basis;

(7) assistance in the coordinated placement of personnel resources from various college and school training programs such as psychology, administration, curriculum,and teaching into specific school settings in order to explore concentrated, "critical mass," approaches to program and staff renewal;

(8) the generation of monies quite possibly not available to either system independent of the other;

(9) the development of short-term critical problem-solving task forces made up of personnel from both systems to itensively respond to crises; personnel could be placed on a rotating on-call basis so that a small "blue-ribbon" group could devote three to ten solid days to a major problem if needed."

REFERENCES

1. Howsam, Robert B. et. al., Educating a Profession, American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, Washington, D.C., 1976, p. 42.
2. Fuller, Frances F., "A Conceptual Framework for a Personalized Teacher Education Program," Theory Into Practice, Volume XIII, No. 2.
3. Haberman, Martin, "Twenty-Three Reasons Universities Can't Educate Teachers," Journal of Teacher Education, Volume XXII, No. 2, Summer, 1971, p. 138.
4. Clark, David L., and Guba, Egon G., "An Inventory of Contextual Factors and Conditions Affecting Individual and Institutional Behavior in Schools, Colleges and Departments of Education," A Tentative Report, RITE Project, School of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, 1976, p. 14.
5. Bush, Robert N., "Teacher Education for the Future: Focus Upon an Entire School," Journal of Teacher Education, Volume XXVI, No. 2, Summer, 1975, p. 149.
6. Joyce, Bruce R., et. al., ISTE Report I, Issues to Face, (A Project Sponsored by the National Center for Educational Statistics and the Teacher Corps), Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, Palo Alto, California, 1976.
7. Joyce, Bruce R., Op. Cit., p. 2.
8. Howey, Kenneth R., Current Perspectives and Evolving Trends in Inservice Education in the United States, (A Monograph Prepared for the United States/Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development Forum of Education Organization Leaders) Optimum Computer Systems Inc., New York, New York, 1976.

9. Houston, Robert W., et. al., Project Description and Organization: School Based Teacher Educators, University of Houston Teacher Center, Houston, Texas, 1976.

10. Howey, Kenneth R., "Inservice Training for Open Classroom Teachers," ISTE Report IV, Creative Authority and Collaboration, Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, Palo Alto, California, 1976, p. 90.

11. Howey, Kenneth R., Op. Cit., pp. 77, 78.